arXiv:1607.04885v1 [math.GR] 17 Jul 2016

ON A CONJECTURE OF IMRICH AND MÜLLER

S. V. IVANOV

Abstract. A conjecture of Imrich and Müller on rank of the intersection of subgroups of free groups is disproved.

Let F be a free group of finite rank, let $\mathrm{r}(F)$ denote the rank of F and let $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(F) := \max(\mathrm{r}(F)-1, 0)$ be the reduced rank of F. Recall that the Hanna Neumann conjecture [15] on subgroups of a free group claims that if H_1, H_2 are finitely generated subgroups of F, then $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2) \leq \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)$. It was shown by Hanna Neumann [15] that $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2) \leq 2\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)$. For relevant discussions, results, proofs, and generalizations of this conjecture, the reader is referred to [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [7], [8], [9], [10], [12], [14], [16], [17].

In 1994, Imrich and Müller [6] proved that if H_1, H_2 are finitely generated subgroups of a free group F and one of H_1, H_2 has finite index in the subgroup $\langle H_1, H_2\rangle$ generated by H_1, H_2, then

$$\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\langle H_1, H_2\rangle)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2) \leq \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2). \tag{1}$$

Imrich and Müller also conjectured in [6] that the inequality (1) holds whenever H_1, H_2 satisfy the following two conditions (C1)–(C2).

(C1) If $K_1 \cap K_2 = H_1 \cap H_2$, where K_i is a free factor of H_i, then $K_i = H_i$, $i = 1, 2$.

(C2) The intersection $H_1 \cap H_2$ contains no nontrivial free factor of $\langle H_1, H_2\rangle$.

Moreover, Imrich and Müller [6] remarked that the condition (C1) alone is not sufficient to imply (1) and they discussed an example for which (C1) holds while (1) and (C2) fail. The existence of a nontrivial free factor in the intersection $H_1 \cap H_2$ was instrumental in construction of the example of [6].

Note that the inequality (1) would provide a much tighter than the Hanna Neumann conjecture's bound for $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2)$ by incorporating the coefficient $\frac{1}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\langle H_1, H_2\rangle)}$ when conditions (C1)–(C2) are satisfied and this looks quite remarkable. Curiously, the inequality (1) holds true for subspaces H_1, H_2 of a finite dimensional vector space V if $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H)$ is understood as the dimension of a subspace $H \subseteq V$. Nevertheless, this conjecture of Imrich and Müller can be disproved as follows.

Theorem. *There are two subgroups H_1, H_2 of a free group F such that H_1, H_2 satisfy conditions (C1)–(C2) and $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1) = 3$, $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2) = 5$, $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2) = 8$, and $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\langle H_1, H_2\rangle) = 2$. In particular, the inequality* (1) *fails for H_1, H_2.*

Proof of Theorem. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set, called an alphabet, and let $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1} := \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$, where $\mathcal{A}^{-1}$ is the set of formal inverses of elements of $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{A}^{-1}$ is disjoint from $\mathcal{A}$. Let $F(\mathcal{A})$ denote the free group whose free generators are elements of $\mathcal{A}$. A graph Γ is called *labeled* if Γ is equipped with a function $\varphi : E\Gamma \to \mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$, where $E\Gamma$ is the set

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20E05, 20E07, 20F65, 57M07.
Supported in part by the NSF under grant DMS 09-01782.

of oriented edges of Γ, such that $\varphi(e^{-1}) = \varphi(e)^{-1}$ for every $e \in E\Gamma$. If $p = e_1 \dots e_\ell$ is a path in a labeled graph Γ, where $e_1, \dots, e_\ell \in E\Gamma$, then the label $\varphi(p)$ of p is the word $\varphi(p) := \varphi(e_1) \dots \varphi(e_\ell)$ over $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$. The initial vertex of a path p is denoted p_- and the terminal vertex of p is denoted p_+.

We now construct some subgroups of a free group by means of their Stallings graphs, for definitions see [1], [12], [17].

Let k, ℓ, m, n be some positive integers such that $m \geq \max(\ell, n)$. Consider three closed labeled paths q_a, q_b, q_c such that $\varphi(q_a) = a^{k\ell}$, $\varphi(q_b) = b^{km}$, $\varphi(q_c) = c^{kn}$. A vertex of q_x, $x \in \{a, b, c\}$, at a distance from $(q_x)_- = (q_x)_+$ that is divisible by k, is called a *phase* vertex of q_x. We connect some ℓ of phase vertices of q_b to the ℓ phase vertices of q_a with edges $f_1, \dots, f_\ell$ so that $(f_i)_- \in q_b$, $(f_i)_+ \in q_a$ are all distinct and $\varphi(f_i) = d$, $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. We also connect some n of phase vertices of q_b to the n phase vertices of q_c with edges $g_1, \dots, g_n$ so that $(g_i)_- \in q_b$, $(g_i)_+ \in q_c$ are all distinct and $\varphi(g_i) = e$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $\Gamma(k, \ell, m, n)$ denote a labeled graph constructed this way, where $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1} = \{a^{\pm 1}, b^{\pm 1}, c^{\pm 1}, d^{\pm 1}, e^{\pm 1}\}$, see Fig. 1 where the graph $\Gamma(1, 1, 1, 1)$, also denoted $\Gamma(\bar{1})$, is depicted.



Figure 1

Note $\Gamma(k, \ell, m, n)$ is not uniquely defined because there are choices for $(f_j)_-, (g_{j'})_- \in q_b$. Let $H(\Gamma(k, \ell, m, n))$ denote the subgroup of the free group $F(\mathcal{A})$ which consists of all the words $\varphi(p)$, where p is a closed path in a fixed graph $\Gamma(k, \ell, m, n)$ such that $p_- = p_+ = (q_b)_-$. It is immediate from the definitions that $H(\Gamma(\bar{1})) = \langle b, dad^{-1}, ece^{-1} \rangle$ and, for every $\Gamma(k, \ell, m, n)$, the subgroup $H(\Gamma(k, \ell, m, n))$ is a subgroup of $H(\Gamma(\bar{1}))$. It is easy to check that $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H(\Gamma(k, \ell, m, n))) = \ell + n$.

Consider two such graphs $\Gamma(7, 1, 3, 2)$, $\Gamma(11, 2, 5, 3)$ and associated subgroups

$$H_1 := H(\Gamma(7, 1, 3, 2)), \quad H_2 := H(\Gamma(11, 2, 5, 3)).$$

Denote $\Delta_1 := \Gamma(7, 1, 3, 2)$ and $\Delta_2 := \Gamma(11, 2, 5, 3)$. Since $m_i = \ell_i + n_i$ for the graph Δ_i, $i = 1, 2$, we may assume that every phase vertex of Δ_1 and Δ_2 has degree 3. Note that the parameters are chosen so that $\gcd(|q_{x,1}|, |q_{x,2}|) = 1$ for every $x \in \{a, b, c\}$. Indeed, $|q_{a,1}| = 7$, $|q_{a,2}| = 22$, $|q_{b,1}| = 21$, $|q_{b,2}| = 55$, $|q_{c,1}| = 14$, $|q_{c,2}| = 33$. Now it is easy to see that the entire pullback $\Delta_1 \underset{\Gamma(\bar{1})}{\times} \Delta_2$ is a graph of the form $\Gamma(77, 2, 15, 6)$. In particular, this pullback is connected and $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2) = -\chi(\Gamma(77, 2, 15, 6)) = 8$. On the other hand, it is immediate that $\langle H_1, H_2 \rangle = H(\Gamma(\bar{1}))$, hence $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\langle H_1, H_2 \rangle) = 2$. It remains to show that the subgroups H_1, H_2 satisfy the conditions (C1)–(C2).

Suppose K_i is a finitely generated subgroup of H_i, $i = 1, 2$, and $K_1 \cap K_2 = H_1 \cap H_2$. Let $\Delta(K_i)$ denote the Stallings graph of K_i, $i = 1, 2$. Then there is a canonical locally injective graph map $\Delta(K_i) \to \Gamma(\bar{1})$, $i = 1, 2$, that factors through Δ_i. Since $K_1 \cap K_2 = H_1 \cap H_2$, it follows that $\Psi := \Delta_1 \underset{\Gamma(\bar{1})}{\times} \Delta_2$ is equal to

$\mathrm{core}(\Delta(K_1) \underset{\Gamma(\bar{1})}{\times} \Delta(K_2))$ and the projection map $\Psi \to \Delta_i$ factors through $\Delta(K_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. Observe that for every vertex $v \in V\Delta_i$ of degree 3, there exists a vertex $w \in V\Psi$ of degree 3 that maps to v. Hence, there is a vertex $u \in V\Delta(K_i)$ of degree 3 that maps to v. This means that $-\chi(\Delta(K_i)) \geq -\chi(\Delta_i)$, whence $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(K_i) \geq \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. If, in addition, K_i is a free factor of H_i, we also have $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(K_i) \leq \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_i)$. Therefore, $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(K_i) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_i)$ and $K_i = H_i$ as desired. The condition (C1) is proven.

Observe that if p_i is a closed reduced path in Δ_i, then the sum of exponents ε on edges x^ε of p, where $\varphi(x) \in \{a, b, c\}$, is divisible by 7 if $i = 1$ and is divisible by 11 if $i = 2$. Since $\langle H_1, H_2\rangle = \langle dad^{-1}, b, ece^{-1}\rangle$, we see that no path $p \in H_i$, where $H_i = \pi_1(\Delta_i, (q_{b,i})_-)$ is the fundamental group of Δ_i at $(q_{b,i})_-$, can be a free generator of $H(\Gamma(\bar{1})) = \langle dad^{-1}, b, ece^{-1}\rangle$. Hence, the condition (C2) is also satisfied for H_1, H_2, and Theorem is proved. $\square$.

As above, let H_1, H_2 be subgroups of a free group F and let $S(H_1, H_2)$ denote a set of representatives of those double cosets H_1tH_2 of F, $t \in F$, that have the property $H_1 \cap tH_2t^{-1} \neq \{1\}$. Define $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2) := \sum_{s\in S(H_1,H_2)} \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap sH_2s^{-1})$.

While the inequality (1) is false in general, some versions of (1) might still be true. For instance, a generalization of the inequality (1) with $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2)$ and $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\langle H_1, H_2, S(H_1, H_2)\rangle)$ in place of $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2)$ and $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\langle H_1, H_2\rangle)$, resp., holds true whenever one of H_1, H_2 has finite index in $\langle H_1, H_2, S(H_1, H_2)\rangle$. In this more general case, Imrich–Müller's arguments [6] for the proof of inequality (1) are essentially retained. Note that this proof is straightforward and independent of an erroneous lemma of [6], discussed in detail by Kent [13], see also [11] for a counterexample and for a repair to this lemma.

We conclude by mentioning an interesting special case of the inequality (1).

Problem. *Does the inequality* (1) *hold true under the assumption* $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2) > 0$*? Equivalently, does the equality* $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2) > 0$ *imply that* $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\langle H_1, H_2\rangle) = 1$*?*

We remark that this Problem has a positive solution for available examples. Curiously, the equality $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2) > 0$ need not imply the equality $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\langle H_1, H_2, S(H_1, H_2)\rangle) = 1$ or even a bound $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\langle H_1, H_2, S(H_1, H_2)\rangle) < C$, where C is a constant, as follows from the following.

Example. Suppose that H_0, H_1 are proper normal subgroups of finite index of a free group $F(a, b)$ and $F(a, b) = H_0H_1$. For instance, one can take normal subgroups H_0, H_1 of $F(a, b)$ so that the quotient groups $F(a, b)/H_0$, $F(a, b)/H_1$ have coprime orders. Then $|F(a, b)/H_i| = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_i)$, $i = 0, 1$, and $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_0 \cap H_1) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_0)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$. Next, let $H_2 := \langle H_0, c_1H_0c_1^{-1}, \ldots, c_{k-1}H_0c_{k-1}^{-1}\rangle$ be a subgroup of the free group $F(a, b, c_1, \ldots, c_{k-1})$. Then it is not difficult to check that $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)$ and $\langle H_1, H_2, S(H_1, H_2)\rangle = F(a, b, c_1, \ldots, c_{k-1})$, which implies that

$$\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\langle H_1, H_2, S(H_1, H_2)\rangle) = k.$$

Hence, the reduced rank $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\langle H_1, H_2, S(H_1, H_2)\rangle)$ could be arbitrarily high in the situation when $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2) > 0$.

References

[1] W. Dicks, *Equivalence of the strengthened Hanna Neumann conjecture and the amalgamated graph conjecture*, Invent. Math. **117**(1994), 373–389.

[2] W. Dicks, *Simplified Mineyev*, preprint, `http://mat.uab.cat/~dicks/SimplifiedMineyev.pdf`
[3] W. Dicks and S. V. Ivanov, *On the intersection of free subgroups in free products of groups*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **144**(2008), 511–534.
[4] W. Dicks and S. V. Ivanov, *On the intersection of free subgroups in free products of groups with no 2-torsion*, Illinois J. Math. **54**(2010), 223–248.
[5] J. Friedman, *Sheaves on graphs, their homological invariants, and a proof of the Hanna Neumann conjecture: with an appendix by Warren Dicks*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **233**(2014), no. 1100. xii+106 pp.
[6] W. Imrich and T. Müller, *On Howson's theorem*, Arch. Math. **62** (1994), 193–198.
[7] S. V. Ivanov, *On the intersection of finitely generated subgroups in free products of groups*, Internat. J. Algebra and Comp. **9**(1999), 521–528.
[8] S. V. Ivanov, *Intersecting free subgroups in free products of groups*, Internat. J. Algebra and Comp. **11**(2001), 281–290.
[9] S. V. Ivanov, *On the Kurosh rank of the intersection of subgroups in free products of groups*, Adv. Math. **218**(2008), 465–484.
[10] S. V. Ivanov, *A property of groups and the Cauchy-Davenport theorem*, J. Group Theory **13**(2010), 21–39.
[11] S. V. Ivanov, *On joins and intersections of subgroups in free groups*, submitted.
[12] I. Kapovich and A. G. Myasnikov, *Stallings foldings and subgroups of free groups*, J. Algebra **248**(2002), 608–668.
[13] R. P. Kent IV, *Intersections and joins of free groups*, Alg. Geom. Topology **9**(2009), 305–325.
[14] I. Mineyev, *Submultiplicativity and the Hanna Neumann conjecture*, Ann. Math. **175**(2012), 393–414.
[15] H. Neumann, *On the intersection of finitely generated free groups*, Publ. Math. **4**(1956), 186–189; Addendum, Publ. Math. **5**(1957), 128.
[16] W. D. Neumann, *On the intersection of finitely generated subgroups of free groups*, Lecture Notes in Math. (Groups-Canberra 1989) **1456**(1990), 161–170.
[17] J. R. Stallings, *Topology of finite graphs*, Invent. Math. **71**(1983), 551–565.

Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801, U.S.A.
E-mail address: `ivanov@illinois.edu`